

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-16, and 18-41 remain in the application. Specifically, claims 16, 28, and 34 have been amended, and claims 1, 3-15, 18-27, 29-33, and 35-41 remain unchanged. Claims 2 and 17 were previously canceled.

Based on the indication of allowed claims 1, 3-16, and 18-33 by the Examiner (described immediately below), the instant claims are now in condition for allowance. No new matter has been added in this Amendment.

Claim Allowance, Claim Amendment, and Comments

As indicated on page 2 of the instant Office Action, the Examiner indicates that claims 1, 3-16, and 18-33 are allowed. The Applicants thank the Examiner for the allowed claims.

Claims 16, 28, and 34 have been amended to correct a typographical error where “the mixing tools” should have read “the spiral mixing arms”. Full support for this amendment, which corrects antecedent basis of these claims, can be found in at least original claim 1 and in paragraphs [0038] and [0074] of the application, as published (US 2007/0282036).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112, Second Paragraph

Claims 34-41 stand rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, for lacking proper antecedent basis for the limitation “the mixing tools”. However, based on the amendment to claim 34 described immediately above, the Applicants respectfully assert that these rejections are now overcome. Specifically, as described above, claim 34 has been amended to correct antecedent basis of the limitation such that reference is now made to “the

spiral mixing arms” rather than to “the mixing tools”. As such, the Applicants respectfully assert that the written description rejections are now overcome or moot. Claims 16 and 28 have also been corrected based on similar claim language.

Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement (IDS)

As indicated on the front page of this Amendment, Applicants submit herewith a Supplemental IDS to meet the ongoing duty of disclosure under 37 CFR § 1.56. The references cited in the Supplemental IDS were recently cited in a related Japanese Application (JP App. No. 2006-552682).

Applicants respectfully submit that the allowed claims remain patentable over these references from the Japanese Patent Office because these references do not teach the subject invention, as specifically claimed. As such, Applicants respectfully assert that even in view of these new references, the instant claims are still in condition for allowance as previously indicated by the Examiner.

Conclusions

The Applicants respectfully submit that all of the claims are now in condition for allowance, which allowance is respectfully requested. However, if the Examiner still believes that claim 34, as amended, as well as the claims that depend therefrom, fails to overcome the instant § 112 rejections, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner cancel claims 34-41, and if also necessary, claims 16 and 28 via an Examiner’s Amendment, in order to place the application in condition for allowance.

If any additional fees are necessary to respond to the outstanding Office Action, you are hereby authorized to charge such fees to Deposit Account No. 08-2789 in the name of Howard & Howard Attorneys PLLC.

Respectfully submitted,

HOWARD & HOWARD ATTORNEYS PLLC

Date: March 4, 2011

/David M. LaPrairie/

David M. LaPrairie, Registration No. 46,295

450 West Fourth Street

Royal Oak, MI 48067-2557

(248) 723-0442